IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.R.RAMAN

&

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE K.HEMA

MONDAY, THE 23RD JULY 2007 / 1ST SRAVANA 1929

WP(C).No. 19806 of 2007(G)

PETITIONER:

K.V.GEORGEKUTTY, S/O.VARGHESE,
KIZHAKKETHIL KOKKADU PUTHENVEEDU, KIZHAKKEKARA,
KOTTARAKKARA.

BY ADV. SRI.B.MOHANLAL

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
POLICE HEAD QUARTERS, KOLLAM DISTRICT.

2. THE CIRCLE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KOTTARAKKARA, KOLLAM DISTRICT.

3. THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KOTTARAKKARA POLICE STATION, KOLLAM DISTRICT.

4. LILLYKUTTY, W/O.LATE KUNJUKUNJU,
JOY VILASOM, VALAKOM, KOTTARAKKARA, KOLLAM DIST.

5. JAYA SAMUEL, W/O.SAMUELKUTTY,
MOONUMURIYIL, PODIYATTUVILA, ARAKKAL VILLAGE,
PATHANAPURAM, KOLLAM DISTRICT.

6. JESSY, W/O.SAJI, KUNDARAZHIKATHU VEEDU,
CHENGAMANAD P.O., KOTTARAKKARA, KOLLAM DISTRICT.

7. JOY, JOY VILASOM, VALAKOM P.O.,
KOTTARAKKARA, KOLLAM DISTRICT.

8. ALICE THOMAS, VADUVILA ST BHAVAN,
MULAVANA P.O., PERAYAM, KUNDARA.

9. ANNAMMA JOSEPH, H.NO.33/616,
MANIMALA ROAD, EDAPPALLY P.O., KOCHI-24.

BY ADV. SRI.GEORGE VARGHESE(PERUMPALLIKUTTIYIL)
SRI.A.R.DILEEP
GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.P.A.SALIM

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 23/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WPC.19806 OF 2007

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXHIBIT P1: COPY OF SETTLEMENT DEED NO.666/1988 DATED 3.3.1988.

EXHIBIT P2: COPY OF COMPLAINT FILED BY THE PETITIONER BEFORE THE 3RD RESPONDENT DATED 26.6.2007.

EXHIBIT P3: COPY OF THE RECEIPT NO.666/PIN/07/D1 DATED 26.6.2007 ISSUED BY THIRD RESPONDENT TO THE PETITIONER.

RESPODNENTS' EXHIBITS:

EXHIBIT R5(a): COPY OF ORDER IN IA.398/07 IN OS.30/07.

EXHIBIT R5(b): COPY OF PLAINT IN O.S.30/2007 FILED BY THE 4TH RESPONDENT OF THE SUB COURT, KOTTARAKKARA.

EXHIBIT R5(c): COPY OF ORDER IN IA.3282/06.

/TRUE COPY/

PA TO JUDGE

P.R.RAMAN & K.HEMA,JJ.

W.P.(C).NO.19806 OF 2007

Dated this the 23rd day of July, 2007

JUDGMENT

Raman, J.

Learned counsel appearing for respondents 4 to 7 on instruction submits that the petitioner has already returned to the United States. The learned Government Pleader submits that the petitioner is not available in the address as shown in the Writ Petition. In the light of the interim order already passed and in view of the submission made by the learned counsel appearing for respondents 4 to 7, there is no necessity to continue the interim order. The Writ Petition has become infructuous. It is open to the petitioner to seek revival of this case, in case the submission made by learned counsel appearing for respondents 4 to 7 is found to be incorrect and if any occasion arises for such continued protection.

P.R.RAMAN, JUDGE

K.HEMA, JUDGE

vgs.